

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of
March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVII, No. 13

MONDAY, JANUARY 21, 1924

WHOLE No. 463

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

800

American Academy in Rome, School of Classical Studies, Summer Session, July 7 -- August 16, 1924

Teachers and Graduate students in the Classics, History, and related subjects are invited to attend the Second Summer Session of the American Academy in Rome.

The work will be conducted by Professor Grant Showerman, of the University of Wisconsin, who was Annual Professor in the School in 1922-1923 and Director of the First Summer Session (1923).

The subjects of study will be:

- (1) History of the City of Rome,
- (2) Monuments of ancient, early Christian, mediaeval, Renaissance, and modern Rome,
- (3) Life and Letters of the Classical period,
- (4) A limited number of sites outside of Rome.

The whole will form a single unified and comprehensive course designed to give the student a thorough acquaintance with the city in its most important phases.

The lectures will be given in the Academy building, before the monuments, and at the sites. Library, museum, and mail privileges of the Academy will be open to the students.

Living rates may be calculated at about \$1.50 a day. Total expenses, including voyage and Academy fee of \$50, may be estimated at somewhat less than \$500.

For further details write to Professor Grant Showerman, 410 North Butler Street, Madison, Wisconsin.

Power in Latin Composition

PLACE'S SECOND YEAR LATIN gives power in Latin Composition. The twenty exercises in the "Training Camp" preceding the reading of Caesar have two hundred sentences and include all the more important constructions. These two hundred sentences according to the plan of the "Training Camp" develop the pupil's power and are sufficient for the needs of any class.

The ability to translate from English into Latin depends on *three* things:

1. An accurate knowledge of the inflections
2. A mastery of a definite vocabulary of carefully selected words
3. A real understanding of the more important principles of syntax

With these three things firmly established, a pupil finds Latin Composition a pleasure, for he can handle it with power. In the SECOND YEAR LATIN the "Training Camp" offers a definite plan for establishing these three essentials, each with single emphasis.

PLACE'S SECOND YEAR LATIN

By PERLEY OAKLAND PLACE, Litt. D.,
Professor of Latin, Syracuse University

576 pages

Richly illustrated

Price, \$1.68

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

A Dead Language Come Alive

Of course you know that the death of Latin has been "greatly exaggerated". But your student cannot be expected to know it if the first book he meets in his Latin course strengthens the exaggeration.

Then select a first-year book that is a "live one". It is not hard to distinguish the kind.

COLLAR AND DANIELL

First Year Latin, Revised by Thornton Jenkins

Some of its live features:

- Enlarged study of derivation
- Shortened vocabularies, about 560 Caesarean words
- Syntax limited to essential constructions
- Nine reviews of vocabulary and much drill material
- Handsome typography, and numerous illustrations in black and colors

GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue

New York

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVII, No. 13

MONDAY, JANUARY 21, 1924

WHOLE No. 463

PROFESSOR PRENTICE ON COLLEGE TEACHING OF THE CLASSICS

College Teaching: Studies in Methods of Teaching in the College. Edited by Paul Klapper, Associate Professor of Education, College of the City of New York, with an Introduction by Nicholas Murray Butler. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company (1920). Pp. xvi + 583.

The contents of the volume entitled College Teaching are as follows:

Preface (iii-vi); Introduction (xiii-xvi); Part One—The Introductory Studies, I, History and Present Tendencies of the American College, Stephen Pierce Duggan (3-30), II, Professional Training for College Teaching, Sidney E. Mezes (31-42); III, General Principles of College Teaching, Paul Klapper (43-82); Part Two—The Sciences, IV, The Teaching of Biology, T. W. Galloway (85-109); V, The Teaching of Chemistry, Louis Kahlenberg (110-125); VI, The Teaching of Physics, Harvey B. Lemon (126-141); VII, The Teaching of Geology, T. C. Chamberlin (142-160); VIII, The Teaching of Mathematics, G. A. Miller (161-182); IX, Physical Education in the College, Thomas A. Storey (183-214); Part Three—The Social Sciences, X, The Teaching of Economics, Frank A. Fetter (217-240); XI, The Teaching of Sociology, Arthur J. Todd (241-256); XII, The Teaching of History, A. American History, Henry W. Elson (256-262), B. Modern European History, Edward Krehbiel (263-278); XIII, The Teaching of Political Science, Charles Grove Haines (279-301); XIV, The Teaching of Philosophy, Frank Thilly (302-319); XV, The Teaching of Ethics, Henry Neumann (320-333); XVI, The Teaching of Psychology, Robert S. Woodworth (334-346); XVII, The Teaching of Education, A. Teaching the History of Education, Herman H. Horne (347-358), B. Teaching Educational Theory in College and University Departments of Education, Frederick E. Bolton (359-376); Part Four—The Languages and Literatures, XVIII, The Teaching of English Literature, Caleb T. Winchester (379-388); XIX, The Teaching of English Composition, Henry Seidel Canby (389-403); XX, The Teaching of the Classics, William K. Prentice (404-423); XXI, The Teaching of the Romance Languages, William A. Nitze (424-439); XXII, The Teaching of German, E. Prokosch (440-453); Part Five—The Arts, XXIII, The Teaching of Music, Edward Dickinson (457-474); XXIV, The Teaching of Art, Holmes Smith (475-497); Part Six—Vocational Subjects, XXV, The Teaching of Engineering Subjects, Ira O. Baker (501-524); XXVI, The Teaching of Mechanical Drawing, James D. Phillips (525-532); XXVII, The Teaching of Journalism, Talcott Williams (533-554); XXVIII, Business Education, Frederick B. Robinson (555-576); Index (577-583).

I have given the Table of Contents in full because the wide-awake teacher of the Classics will realize that his own subject has many points of contact with other subjects discussed in the book. Of course, to the teachers of the Classics by far the most interesting chapter in the book will be the discussion of the teach-

ing of the Classics (404-423), by Professor William Kelley Prentice, of Princeton University. Professor Prentice begins by declaring that methods of teaching are determined to a large extent by appreciation of the objects to be attained. Then he sets forth various aims which, in his opinion, are common to all Classical Departments in American Colleges (405-406):

1. To train students, through the acquisition and use of the ancient languages, in memory, accuracy, analysis and logic, clearness and fluency of expression, and style.

2. To enable certain students to read with profit and enjoyment the masterpieces of Greek and Latin literature.

3. To impart to certain students a knowledge, as complete as possible, of the classical civilization as a whole. To a complete knowledge of this civilization belongs all that the ancients possessed or did, all that they thought or wrote, whether or not any particular part of it had an influence upon later times or is, in itself, interesting or valuable now. All parts alike are phenomena of the life of these ancient peoples and so of the life of the human race.

4. To impart a knowledge and understanding of the thoughts and ideas, the forms of expression, the institutions, and the experiences of the ancients, in so far as these are either actually valuable in themselves to the modern world or have influenced the development of modern civilization.

Besides these aims which are common to all, there are certain others less generally pursued by classical teachers in this country. Among these are:

5. To make students familiar with "the Greek (and Latin) in English", i. e. with the etymology and history of words in our own language which had their origin in or through Greek or Latin.

6. To trace the influences of the classic literature upon modern literature and thought.

7. To train those who expect to teach the Classics in pedagogical methods, and to familiarize them with modern pedagogical appliances.

8. To teach the language of the New Testament and of the Church Fathers.

Professor Prentice then asks whether all of these aims properly concern all classical students. He thinks that all will agree that those described under 7 and 8 do not concern the average student of the Classics. He seems to think also that it should not be the aim of classical teaching to give all classical students some knowledge of the classic civilization as a whole. But a more important question, to his mind, is this: Should all who study the masterpieces of the ancient literatures be taught to study them in the original language? Seeking to answer this question, Professor Prentice balances against each other the varying views held by different parts of the teaching fraternity with respect to the subject, and gives more or less precise information as to courses in different Colleges and Universities, based upon the attitude of mind in the Classical Departments in the Colleges and the Universities with re-

spect to the question under consideration. His own opinion in answer to the question the reader is obliged to piece together in passages more or less widely separated in his chapter. He distinguishes, for example (408), certain literary productions whose value consists chiefly in the aesthetic qualities of their form, with the result that the excellence and the influence of such productions depend upon the particular language in which they were written, from other writings, such as Thucydides's History or Aristotle's Constitution of Athens. Works of the former sort lose very much in translation; the latter, Professor Prentice seems to think, do not.

On page 417 he writes as follows:

... To say that the Psalms and the Gospels have no value or little value for the world apart from the original form and language in which they were written would, of course, be absurd. Is it any less absurd to say that the study of the Homeric poems, the Attic tragedies, the works of Thucydides and Plato would have little value for students unless this literature were studied in the original language?

On pages 419-421, Professor Prentice discusses in a very interesting, suggestive, and sane way courses in Greek literature or in Latin literature, or in both sometimes, which require no use of either Greek or Latin, and no knowledge of Greek or Latin on the part of the student. Practically all these courses, he thinks, are primarily lecture courses, with more or less collateral reading controlled by tests and examinations. He thinks that most people believe, and rightly too, that College students derive little benefit from collateral reading controlled only in this way, because such reading is usually superficial. He thinks it possible, however, to conduct such courses in such a way that students would acquire

... by their own efforts a knowledge of the classical literature and civilization far more extensive and more satisfying than in courses largely devoted to translating from Greek and Latin. Such courses would not merely substitute English translations for the originals, and treat these translations as the originals are treated in courses of the traditional type; the ancient literature would be studied in the same way as English literature is studied. For example, in a course of this kind on Greek literature, in dealing with the Odyssey the students would discuss in class, or present written reports upon, the composition of the poem as a whole, and the relation to the main plot of different episodes such as the quest of Telemachus, his visit to Pylos and Lacedaemon, the scene in Calypso's cave, the building of the raft, the arrival of Odysseus among the Phaeacians, his account of his own adventures, his return to Ithaca, the slaying of the wooers, etc.; also the characters of the poem, their individual experiences and behavior in various circumstances, and the ideas which they express, comparing these characters and ideas with those of modern times. In dealing with the drama, the students would study the composition of each play, present its plot in narrative form, and criticize it from the dramatic as well as from the literary standpoint; they would discuss the characters and situations, and the ideas embodied in each. In dealing with Thucydides they would discuss the plan of his book and the artistic elements in its composition; also the critical standards of the author, his methods, his objectivity, and his personal bias. They would study the debates in which the arguments on both sides of great issues are presented, expressing their own opinions on the ques-

tions involved. They would study the great descriptions, such as the account of the siege of Plataea, the plague at Athens, the last fight in the harbor of Syracuse, making a summary in their own language of the most essential or effective details. Lastly they would discuss such figures as Pericles, Nicias and Alcibiades, Archidamus, Brasidas and Hermocrates, their characters, principles, and motives. In dealing with Plato they would study the character of Socrates and those ideas contained in the Platonic dialogues which can be most readily comprehended by college students.

I should like to see Professor Prentice—or any one else—conduct such a course, at least in the limits of time likely to be available anywhere for it. Incidentally, I should like to hear of a course in English literature conducted in that fashion.

Professor Prentice believes (421) that the study of the Classics is not properly "confined to the Greek and Latin literatures". Such study must include the military, political, social, and economic history of the ancient Greeks and Romans, their institutions, their religion, morals, philosophy, science, art, and private life. He thinks that all these subjects can best be taught by those most familiar with the classical civilization in all its phases, and most thoroughly trained in the interpretation and criticism of its literature. But he would not have history—ancient history—taught from a literary point of view.

History should be an account of what actually took place, derived from every available source and not from a synthesis of a literary tradition.

He thinks that the teaching of Greek and Roman history, so far as it has been conducted by members of Classical Departments, has been mistaken, because such courses have been based

upon the translation and discussion of the works of certain ancient authors, whose accounts are not only false and misleading in many respects, but characteristically omit those factors in the ancient life which are the most significant and interesting to the modern world.

At the close of his discussion (422-423), after having reviewed the aims of the teaching of the Classics in American Colleges, as he understands them, Professor Prentice gives his own opinions concerning the proper aims of the teaching of the Classics in American Colleges, as follows:

1. An appreciation of the best of the classical literature. For this is, in many respects, the best literature which we have at all, even when without any allowances it is compared with the best of modern literatures. Much of it is universal in character. It is also the foundation of the modern literatures. By learning to appreciate it, students would learn to judge and appreciate all literature.

2. A familiarity with the characters and narratives of the ancient literature. The knowledge of these characters, their behavior under various vicissitudes of fortune, and their experiences, would of itself be a valuable possession and equipment for life.

3. A knowledge of the ideas of the ancient Greeks and Romans, revealed and developed in their literature, and tested in the realities of their life. Many of these ideas are of the utmost value today, and are in danger of being overlooked and forgotten in this materialistic age of ours, unless they are constantly recalled to our minds by such studies.

4. A knowledge of the actual experiences of the

ancients, as individuals and as nations, their experiments in democracy and other forms of government, in imperialism, arbitration, and the like, their solutions of the moral, social, and economic problems which were as prominent in their world as in ours.

The concluding sentences of his discussion are as follows:

To realize these aims old methods should be revised and improved, new methods developed. For there can hardly be a study more valuable and practical than this.

It will be apparent, I think, from what has been written above, that Professor Prentice's chapter is for the most part a survey of the courses in Greek and Latin, in Greek and Roman civilization, etc., as they have been given in recent years in American Colleges. The discussion of the aims, actual and proper, of the teaching of the Classics in our Colleges and Universities is interesting. But, frankly, I find little, if anything, definite in the entire chapter, with respect to method—save under one topic, courses with respect to Greek and Latin literature, Greek and Latin civilization, in which no use of the Greek and Latin languages is required. Aside from that, Professor Prentice's discussion is thus to me unsatisfactory, because it offers nothing definite, or little that is definite, with respect to method. We all know that old methods should be revised and improved, and that new methods should be developed. We are constantly waiting—in vain, for the most part—for someone to tell us what form the revision should take, and what new methods are to be developed.

CHARLES KNAPP

BACCHYLIDES XVI (XVII)¹

Some of us will clearly remember the paeon of joy with which a quarter of a century ago the finding of the lone Egyptian papyrus containing the poems of Bacchylides was greeted. A great name, highly esteemed by the ancients, had suddenly and unexpectedly become not a name only, but a living reality. A new opportunity opened to Greek scholars to do pioneer work in textual criticism, to indulge in that most fascinating of indoor sports, the filling of lacunae with ingenious conjectures. New light was to be thrown on problems of metrical structure. A whole new series of epinikian odes was to be laid side by side with those of Pindar.

After the initial wonder of new discovery, Bacchylides was marvellously fortunate in his editors. The editio princeps (we almost had the Renaissance back again) was put forth under the aegis of Frederic C. Kenyon, of the British Museum's Department of Manuscripts. This was followed by the acute and critical work of Blass in Germany, and a little later by the edition of Jebb in England, which seems to me still not only a work of rare scholarship, but of prime literary art as well, by a man who knew Pindar as few others have known him, and whose taste was as cultured as his

scholarship was sound. No poet could have been more happily introduced to the world of scholarship.

And yet I do not think that this new old poet has taken the place that is his due either in the University class-room or in the study of Greek scholars of these recent years. His long popularity of eight centuries and more in ancient times should mean something more significant than a mere new edition to place on a library shelf and leave unread.

This paper has a very modest purpose. It aims to vivify, if possible, one of the more notable of Bacchylides's odes and to bring it before you in English dress, not as a curiosity, or a problem, or a subject of learned discussion, but simply as a piece of vigorous poetic art, very spontaneous, very direct, very easy of apprehension, and to me very charming. Only a brief introduction will be necessary.

Everyone will at once think of three lyric poets in any discussion of a poem of Bacchylides: Simonides of Ceos, Bacchylides, his nephew, and Pindar. Simonides and Bacchylides are of course linked by their common birthplace, their relationship, and by some resemblances of manner, and of art forms. Pindar comes in mind at once as the great master of the epinikian ode, the type that bulks so large also in the recovered work of the younger poet. Simonides, though probably a greater poet than his nephew, is, as everybody knows, very inadequately represented in the fragments which remain. It would be very interesting to know how he handled the victory ode, but of his odes of this sort we have only inconsiderable fragments. His best surviving work is found in some of his noble epigrams and elegiacs, and in the touching threnos, the Lament of Danae.

Pindar and Bacchylides invite a brief word of comparison because both were so long famous for victory odes, and a goodly number of odes of this type are preserved in both cases. Pindar is brilliant, swift, and arrogant, like his own eagle, disdainful of rivals, and master of revealing epithets, that dazzle in a sudden flash and then justify themselves as they are fully caught. Bacchylides, on the other hand, is epic rather than lyric in manner, simplicity itself in form and diction, with a certain Ionian grace. He is master of crisp and striking dialogue, loves to picture a scene in some detail, whereas Pindar is abrupt and impatient of detail. The very simple charm of the younger poet gained him a wide public and a long continued vogue.

Ode XVI (XVII), which I have chosen, has been generally recognized as one of the most striking of the poems recovered. It was numbered XVII in Kenyon's edition, but two fragments in the earlier part of the book, regarded by Kenyon as separate, were afterward recognized as parts of one mutilated poem. Hence the Ode originally numbered XVII is now numbered XVI. This poem is entitled 'Theseus, or the Youths and the Maidens'. The text is very fully preserved, and the few lacunae, occurring where the edges of the papyrus were broken, have all been filled by conjectures which are practically certain. If this were a learned philological paper, I should be obliged to justify these

¹This paper was read at the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Rutgers College, May 4, 1923.

conjectures or to suggest others. But, as I have warned you already, I am offering no keen scholarship, but a mere appreciation. So I let them stand as Jebb, whose feeling for the Greek lyric was so splendidly sure, has left them.

The subject is the third voyage from Athens to Crete, in which Minos, having selected the seven youths and the seven maidens of Athens, is conducting them to Crete as victims for the Minotaur. In this poem the young hero Theseus is a supercargo, having apparently volunteered, and is destined to slay the Minotaur and to end the tragic tribute. The poem plunges in medias res, picturing the vessel on her way to Crete. Minos, smitten with the charms of Eriboea, would press his suit on the helpless victim. Theseus boldly intervenes. A spirited dialogue ensues in which the young hero claims the right as son of Poseidon to demand justice for these youths and maidens against any aggression not nominated in the bond, even though the aggressor be the son of Zeus. Minos appeals to Zeus for a portent confirming his sonship. The boon is granted, and he in his turn dares Theseus, the reputed son of Aegeus, King of Athens, to leap into the sea, in order to prove his claim that his true father is Poseidon himself.

This the hero promptly does, and the ship sails on. All is apparently lost, when lo! beside the ship's stern the hero reappears with some tokens of Poseidon's favor. Thereupon his triumph is chanted by the sea, by the Nereids, and by the trembling youths and maidens. Here the poem abruptly ends, with a brief prayer for the success of the Cean choir which rendered the poem.

The poem, according to most of the metrists, is written in 5/8 time, where the cretic foot largely predominates, varied of course with other five-time feet, such as the first, third, and fourth paeon. But there are so many substitutions of the bacchius and the choriambus, that I am inclined (and I am glad some learned men agree with me) to think it was rather in the much easier and more common 6/8 time, with the appropriate irrational lengthening where it is required. It is needless to say that in my metrical rendering I have not attempted to imitate the original metrical movement except in the most general way. All I can claim for my version is that I have preserved the original sense with the utmost fidelity and have done my best to reflect the original spirit. Any success is at best relative. With Pindar it would be a forlorn hope. In the case of the far simpler verse of Bacchylides I venture the following attempt.

THESEUS, OR THE YOUTHS AND MAIDENS

The dark-prowed vessel bore
The warrior Theseus and the seven twice told
Of bright Ionian youth, and onward rolled,
Cleaving the sea, toward the Cretan shore,
For on its far-resplendent sail
Blew Boreas's favoring gale,
Thus the warlike will
Of famed Athena to fulfill.
And now in Minos's breast
The Cyprian goddess, lovely-filleted,
Had placed her favors dread,

Tormenting him; no more
Could he his hand arrest,
But touched the maiden's fair, white cheek.
And Eriboea cried full sore
On Pandion's bronze-breastplated son for aid.
When Theseus saw the maid,
His dark eyes rolled beneath his brow,
While fierce grief pierced his heart, I trow,
And he thus began to speak.

"O hero, son of highest Zeus,
Thou pilotest on unholy course
Thy heart to purpose of abuse;
Restrain that insolent force.
What the mighty fate of the gods to us assigns,
And as the scale of justice to us inclines,
This, our appointed doom,
We shall fulfill,
Whene'er it come;
But check thy grievous will.
Though Phoenix's lovely daughter, of gracious
[fame,

With Zeus, beneath the brows of Ida lay
And brought thee, highest of mortals, to the day,
So to wealthy Pittheus's daughter once there came
Sea-god Poseidon, and me to him she bore,
And Nereids, violet-tressed,
Gave her the gold-embroidered veil she wore.
Therefore, heed my behest;
Restrain, O Cnossian warlord, in thy breast
Thy wantonness toward these distressed;
For I should rather see no more
Of deathless dawn the lovely light,
If thou thy violence fulfill
On one of these against their will.
Rather our hands shall show their might;
The gods will judge results aright".

So much the warlike hero spake,
And marvel did the sailors take
At the lofty courage of the man;
But the heart of the kinsman of the Sun
Was filled with wrath at the daring one,
And he wove the wile of a new-laid plan,
And thus began.

"O mighty father Zeus, hear thou my prayer:
If truly Phoenix's white-armed daughter bare
Me unto thee, from heaven send down now
[sheer

Thy lightning swift, with fiery hair,
A token manifest and clear".
"And if Troezenian Aethra was thy mother,
Thy sire earth-shaker Poseidon, not another,
Casting thy body, bold,
Into thy father's halls,
Fetch this bright ring of gold
From the deep sea where it falls.
Yet verily thou shalt see,
If Cronos's son for me,
The Lord of the thunder,
Ruler of all,
Will work this wonder,
And hear my call".

Then mighty Zeus heard his unmeasured prayer,
And gave to Minos a boon beyond compare,
Desiring for his dear son's sake
The honor plain to all to make,
And lightened through the air.

And when the hero, battle-staunch, espied
This welcome sign, he raised on high
His hands toward the glorious sky,
And thus exultant cried:

"Thou seest, O Theseus, these gifts of Zeus are plain.
Now leap thou into the loudly-roaring main,
For Cronos's son, thy father, Poseidon the king,
Throughout the widely-wooded earth will bring

To pass, that thou to high renown attain".
Nor did the other's spirit quail.
On the well-built stern he took his stand
And leaped. The plain of the sea
Received him graciously.
Zeus's son at heart was awed, but he gave command
To hold the fair ship to the gale.

But fate was shaping another course:
The swiftly-faring bark sped on,
For the north wind blew behind with force.
But all the band of Athenian youth,
When he leaped in the sea, shuddered in truth,
While from lily eyes and faces wan
They shed soft tears, refusing not
Necessity's stern lot.

But dolphins, dwellers of the sea,
Bore mighty Theseus speedily,
Till he had come
To his equestrian father's home.
And entering the hall
Where the gods abide,
In fear he espied
The far-famed daughters all
Of blessed Nereus old,
For from their limbs, fire-bright,
There shone a shimmer of light,
And round their hair
Fillets were rolled
Of braided gold,
And dancing there
With lissom feet,
Their hearts in gladness beat.

And large-eyed Amphitrite, his sire's spouse,
August and dear, saw he in the lovely house;
And she a purple cloak around him cast,
On his thick locks a perfect chaplet placed,
With which, rose-decked, her wedding day, long
[past,

By artful Aphrodite once was graced.
To wise men naught transcends belief,
Whate'er the gods may will.
Beside the light ship's stern he rose.
Ah, then what woes
Did pierce the heart of the Cnossian chief,
When he came from the sea, unmoistened still,
A marvel to friends and foes!

About his limbs did shine
The gifts divine;
And the sea-maids on their brilliant thrones,
With new-found cheer, cried out in joyous tones:
The deep sea uttered its sound,
And the youths and maidens around
With lovely voice chanted their joy profound.

O god of Delos's isle,
Delight thou in our Cean choir:
May these to fortunes high aspire,
And win heaven's smile!

RUTGERS COLLEGE

LOUIS BEVIER

CICERO'S RELIGIOUS UNBELIEF

That the Pontifex Maximus at Rome should be an atheist is sorely against our present conception of religion; and yet, while Julius Caesar's position at the head of the Roman State religion squares ill with our sense of fitness, this can occasion no more wonder than that the celebrated augur, Marcus Tullius Cicero, should scan the heavens for propitious signs from the gods, and scrupulously observe the peckings of the holy chickens—proceedings which he ridicules repeatedly in the *De Divinatione*.

Cicero was named augur in 53 B. C., by Pompey and Hortensius, to fill the place left vacant by the death of Crassus (*Cicero*, 2 Phil. 4)¹, and he addressed himself with unextinguishable zest to the task of mastering the esoteric ritual and tradition of the sacred college². Cicero's boyhood association with the aged augur, Scaevola, is well known to the readers of the *Laelius*. After having donned the *toga virilis*, Cicero had been entrusted by his father to the famous augur, at whose side he remained, as long as possible, absorbing his words of wisdom. Cicero says (*Laelius* 1): itaque multa ab eo prudenter disputata, multa etiam breviter et commode dicta memoriae mandabam fierique studentium eius prudentia doctior. Cicero, then, from youth, cherished a feeling of regard for augurs, though, as we shall see, he had slender faith in augury. Rome was indeed fortunate in having in the Augural College men such as Scaevola and Cicero—men of solid understanding, with the highest interests of the State at heart. That there had been a declension in the seriousness with which augurs took their profession is patent from *De Divinatione* 1.25, where Quintus, Cicero's brother, is represented as saying, *Auspicia vero vestra quam constant! quae quidem nunc a Romanis auguribus ignorantur*³. This was written in 44 B. C.

Cicero suggests his own scepticism in *De Divinatione* 1.1, *Magnifica quaedam res et salutaris, si modo est ulla; and it is his own doubts which have led him ut diligenter etiam atque etiam argumenta cum argumentis comparemus* (1.7). He was blissfully unconscious of any great inconsistency in his performances as augur, especially since augurs might, by forcing divination by thimblerrigging (1.27), do good to the State; moreover, Cicero felt that the religious institutions of antiquity should be revered. He would even go so far as to say that the Consuls, Publius Claudius and Lucius Junius, deserved capital punishment for setting sail, in the First Punic War, contrary to the auspices (2.71). Cicero's love for his country, once at least, led him to sanction bribery. In *Ad Atticum* 2.1, Cicero complains to his friend that Cato often does positive ill to his country, though with honorable motives. Cato had voted for a law bidding <eum> in iudicium venire, qui ob rem iudicandam pecuniam acceperit (2.8). The upshot was a quarrel between the Knights and the *curia*. Cicero writes (2.8): 'Quid ergo? istos', inquires, 'mercede conductos habebimus?' Quid faciemus, si aliter non possumus? In *De Natura Deorum* 2.7, Lucilius, who is represented as speaking for the Stoics, says that, when the sacred chickens, freed from their coops, had refused to eat, Publius Clodius gave orders that they should be plunged into water, that they might at least drink. The laughter evinced from this action turned to tears after the disaster of the Roman fleet: quid? collega eius <L.> Iunius eodem bello nonne tempestate classem amisit,

¹My citations are from the following texts (Teubner, Leipzig): *Cicero*, *De Divinatione*, C. F. W. Mueller (1915), *De Natura Deorum*, O. Plasberg (1917), *Laelius De Amicitia*, C. F. W. Mueller (1909), *In Catilinam*, C. F. W. Mueller (1903), *Ad Atticum*, C. F. W. Mueller (1898); *Lucretius*, A. Brieger (1914).

²See E. G. Sihler, *Cicero of Arpinum*, 257.

³See Georg Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 533.

cum auspiciis non paruisset? itaque Clodius a populo condemnatus est, Iunius necem sibi ipse conscivit (*ibidem*).

Quintus had asserted (De Divinatione 1.22) that it was difficult for an augur to damn his own profession—a remark which Marcus brushes aside with the words (2.70), Marso fortasse, sed Romano facillimus. Non enim sumus ii nos augures, qui avium reliquorumve signorum observatione futura dicamus. The implication is that the auguries were unblushingly constrained to comport with the will of the augurs. Cicero, with no apparent sense of incongruity, outlines (2.70), his reasons for observing the ritual of augury, while having no faith in its divine sanction and direction: retinetur autem et ad opinionem vulgi et ad magnas utilitates rei publicae mos, religio, disciplina, ius augurium, collegii auctoritas. Again (2.28) we read: Ut ordiar ab haruspicina, quam ego rei publicae causa communisque religionis colendam censeo. I gather, from this remark, that *haruspicina* was not alone a private, but an official State method of divination. We know that, in the period of the kings, the haruspices were consulted officially. Livy (1.31) writes about a rain of stones which fell on the Alban Mount, and about a loud voice which issued from a grove, bidding the Albans perform again long neglected rites. The Romans, in consequence, held a nine days' festival, either prompted by the voice from the mountain, or on the advice of the haruspices. Again, in Livy 1.56, we read the story of the serpent which glided out of a wooden column in the house of Tarquin. The soothsayers, summoned from Etruria, decided to send a mission to the oracle at Delphi.

In De Divinatione 2.131 are these words: Vide igitur, ne, etiamsi divinationem tibi esse concessero, quod numquam faciam, neminem tamen divinum reperire possimus. Cicero iterates his reasons for adhering to the forms of divination (2.148): Nam et maiorum instituta tueri sacris caerimoniisque retinendis sapientis est, et esse praestantem aliquam aeternamque naturam, et eam suspiciendam admirandamque hominum generi pulchritudo mundi ordoque rerum caelestium cogit confiteri. Concerning Pherecydes's prediction, from his observation of some well water, of an earthquake, Cicero comments thus (2.31): Multa istius modi dicuntur in scholis, sed credere omnia vide ne non sit necesse. Once more, in writing about the belief, held by some, that there is a *liaison* between nature and divination from entrails, Cicero asks (2.33): Nonne pudet physicos haec dicere? We have a flat denial of divination in the words *divinationem nego* (2.45). Cicero (2.50) traces the origins of *haruspicina* in Etruria, recounting the story of Tages, who sprang from the earth, cum terra araretur et sulcus altius esset impressus. This Tages had the appearance of a boy, wedded to the wisdom of years. The *bubulcus* who had ploughed up Tages attracted a crowd about Etruria's first haruspex, whereupon Tages discoursed at length on the soothsayers' art to all Etruria there assembled. The unbeliever, Cicero, queries (2.51): Estne quisquam ita desipiens, qui credat exaratum

esse, deum dicam an hominem? Cicero (2.58) is not gullible enough to credit such fictions as this, that Atratum etiam fluvium fluxisse sanguine, deorum sudasse simulacra. Sweat and blood, he holds, come only from living bodies. Certain earths, when mixed with water, bear resemblance to blood and the moisture seen on walls, when the south wind blows, seems to resemble sweat. In De Divinatione 1.74, Quintus had already told Marcus that he believed that the Boeotian seers prophesied victory to the Thebans from the crowing of cocks, quod avis illa victa silere soleret, canere, si vicisset. Cicero says (2.56) that Quintus has better wit than to believe that Jupiter would use chickens to reveal his will. Moreover, Cicero is not convinced that roosters crow only when victorious, and adds, with a twinkle of humor: Magnum vero! quasi pisces, non galli cecinerint! (*ibidem*). In the same chapter, Cicero, with his tongue in his cheek, renders Democritus's explanation of why roosters crow before dawn: depulso enim de pectore et in omne corpus diviso et mitificato cibo cantus edere quiete satiatos; qui quidem "silentio noctis", ut ait Ennius, ". . . favent faucibus rursus cantu plaususque premunt alas".

Even Quintus, though a good Stoic, had his doubts about the reliability of auspices taken from the observation of chickens. It appears that, if the chickens ate so voraciously that some of their food dropped to the ground, it was a good omen. Quintus observes (De Divinatione 1.27): necesse est enim offa obiecta cadere frustum ex pulli ore, cum pascitur.

Cicero, à propos of the Stoic god, writes (2.40): vester autem deus potest non impertire, ut nihilo minus mundum regat et hominibus consulat.

Quintus, following Chrysippus, Antipater, and Posidonius, believed that the defects, portending ill, found in the sacrificial animals were effected just at the time when the sacrifice was being made. His brother twits him thus (2.36): Haec iam, mihi crede, ne aniculae quidem existimant.

Teachers may find it interesting, when they come to Catilinam 3.21, Illud vero nonne ita praesens est, ut nutu Iovis optimi maximi factum esse videatur, ut, cum hodierno die mane per forum meo iussu et coniurati et eorum indices in aedem Concordiae ducerentur, eo ipso tempore signum statueretur?, to set against it De Divinatione 2.47, where Cicero speaks almost jestingly about the setting-up of the statue, of which he made so much in his speech: Et tu scilicet mavis numine deorum id factum quam casu arbitrari, et redemptor, qui columnam illam de Cotta et de Torquato conduxerat faciendam, non inertia aut inopia tardior fuit, sed a deis immortalibus ad istam horam reservatus est. Such threads of inconsistency are not uncommon in the tissue of Cicero's character.

I would not leave the impression with the reader that Cicero treats the subject of divination flippantly. The whole tone of the De Divinatione, despite occasional lapses into pleasantry at the expense of the Stoics and the Epicureans, is elevated and deadly earnest, challenging serious thought. Again and again, in his

liveliest manner, Cicero puts divination to the touch of proof. He urges Quintus (2.60) to trace every novel occurrence to its well-spring; he declares that, even if there be no cause apparent, a cause there nevertheless must be, and that Quintus should set all terrors of the mind at rest by an understanding of the *ratio naturae*. Here we have an echo from Lucretius 1.146-148:

Hunc igitur terrorem animi tenebrasque necessest
non radii solis neque lucida tela diei
discutiant, sed naturae species ratioque.

Lucretius, like Cicero, was an unbeliever; but, unlike the augur, Lucretius was unwilling to temporize with the transparent humbug (to our seeming, at least) of Roman 'religion'.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

ELI EDWARD BURRISS

REVIEW

Greek Life and Thought: A Portrayal of Greek Civilization. By La Rue Van Hook. New York: Columbia University Press (1923). Pp. xiv + 329.

It has been indeed a cheering experience to watch year by year for the past decade or more the steady procession of works on Greek civilization in its various aspects. It seems to betoken a fresh awakening to the enduring value of our Hellenic heritage. Side by side with this literary activity has been witnessed the introduction into our Colleges of courses on Greek civilization. While in no wise a substitute for first-hand acquaintance with Greek, they cannot fail to create in some measure an appreciation of the Greek contribution to modern life and a sympathetic understanding of the motives that actuate the devoted workers in that field. There may even result some reappraisal of the things worth while, some restoration of that true sense of proportion apparently so needed in our time.

It is in that hope that Professor Van Hook has written his book. In it he has endeavored to steer a middle course between those treatises that are too brief or superficial and those that are too technical and learned, keeping ever in mind both the general reader and the student in the class-room.

It is scarcely to be hoped that the result will please everybody. Some will complain that the author has himself been too brief. For such he has provided a Bibliographical Appendix of twenty-one pages (297-317) covering chapter by chapter the topics treated. This Appendix in itself will for many readers be worth the cost of the book. Still others may disagree with his decision to omit some topic. The reviewer, for example, believes that a discussion of Greek dress has as much place in such a work as does the subject of houses and furniture. On the other hand, he can find nothing that he would have omitted in its stead.

The twenty chapters into which the book is divided deal with the following topics:

Sources of Information (1-5); Greek States Apart from Attica (6-16); Attica and Athens (17-22); Architecture and the Monuments of Athens (23-36); House, Furniture, and Vases (37-45); Sculpture (46-62); Athletic Sports and Festivals (63-78); Political, Social, and Economic Conditions of the Athenian

People (79-113); Writing and Books (114-121); Literature (122-151); Athenian Education (152-171); Theater and the Production of Plays (172-184); Tragedy (185-199); Characteristics of Attic Tragedy (200-211); Comedy (212-216); Philosophy (217-251); Religion (252-270); Science (271-279); The New Study of Ancient Greece (280-286); The Genius of the Greeks (287-296).—There are also a Bibliographical Appendix (297-317), and an Index (319-329).

That the author has been able to compress within 297 pages so readable and useful an account of twenty topics any one of which has been the theme of bulky volumes is a tribute to his capacity for selfrestraint as well as to his genius for lucid statement. To only three chapters does he devote as much as thirty pages: VIII. Political, Social, and Economic Conditions of the Athenian People; X. Literature; and XVI. Philosophy. That four pages more should have been devoted to Chapter VIII than to Chapter X at first glance might occasion some surprise, but Chapters XIII-XVI properly belong with X and produce a total of sixty-seven pages more.

Chapter VIII seems to be deserving of special mention. It is easily the best in the book. Written *con amore*, on the basis of the author's own original researches, it speaks with an authority that cannot be denied. It is inspired by the sane scholarship that one has learned to expect from Professor Van Hook, a scholarship that refuses to be overawed by tradition but looks facts in the face and sees things as they are. In this chapter are corrected forever several ancient errors, reprinted unchallenged from age to age and producing a wholly unfair and damaging conception of the Athenian people. I quote a portion of Professor Van Hook's summary (pages 112-113).

With regard to work, it is true that in Athens, as with us, some occupations were thought less desirable and less dignified than others. In no land and at no time is the day-laborer esteemed as highly as the statesman. Drudgery and menial employment the Athenians disliked and avoided; so do we. But the citizen who earned his living in some honest way and accepted money for his services was the rule and not the exception, nor was he as a result a social outcast, but he was a member, in good political and social standing, of the commonwealth.

While the metics, or resident aliens, did not have full participation in political duties and privileges, nor yet complete legal freedom, they did share in large measure the life of the citizens. The door of opportunity and of material and social well-being lay open to them.

Athenian civilization of the Age of Pericles was not dominated by the institution of slavery. . . .

The position of women in Athens was not what it was even in Homeric times, and, from the point of view of the most advanced modern society of the last few years, their lives were unfortunately restricted. The wives and the daughters of Athenian citizens were respected, protected, and no doubt genuinely loved in most cases, and were generally happy and contented, but the fact remains that they had only a minor share in the intellectual freedom and opportunities of that great period.

One wishes that Professor Van Hook had found room in this work to include his refutation of another ancient error, the belief in the exposure of infants in classic times (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17.38).

A very marked merit of the book as a whole is its

success in so stating the case that the American reader will find Greek beliefs, ideals, and practices continually paralleled or illuminated by our own. A fellowship is thus established that should make the reader forget the intervening centuries and welcome the ancient Greek as in a very real sense his spiritual kinsman and elder brother.

Only comparatively trivial points, for the most part, have presented themselves for criticism. Might it not have been better on page 30 to explain that the measurement of the course in the Stadium was not in English feet? In view of the prevalence of 'Olympic' as an epithet of the great games, the wisdom of choosing "Olympian" (30) is questionable ("Olympic" is to be found on pages 71 and 74). The ratio of 5 to 1 for the purchasing power of money in Greek times and to-day (38) seems, in view of present prices, unduly conservative. On page 67 the author seems to imply that the palaestra was to be found only in connection with one of the three great gymnasia at Athens. Having been told at what time the other great games occurred, the reader might expect to be given similar data for the Nemean festival (72). Should not the Greek terms have been substituted for or added to the Latin *amentum* and *cestus* (76, 77)? The two statements regarding the Council of Five Hundred printed on pages 84 and 95 would appear inconsistent. In the first instance it is stated that the duties of the Council "demanded all their time, the Council meeting daily. . .", while on page 95 we read ". . . fifty only of the Council. . . were continuously on duty, so that the majority thus were free to attend to their private affairs". If "Herodotus is not a critical or scientific historian in the modern sense" (137), may not the same be said of Thucydides? The surprising thing seems to be that Herodotus had the critical, scientific spirit so highly developed. One wonders why the wording of the translation from Aristotle's *Poetics* printed on pages 200 and 246 does not harmonize with what is found on page 207. While it is true that some would agree with the statement (213) regarding the serious purpose of the comic poet, the matter is at least open to discussion. A more guarded statement might have accorded better with the author's usual caution.

A few statements connected with the theater have raised doubts in the mind of the reviewer. Was the theater at Epidauros "much larger than the theater at Athens" (177)? On page 178 the diameter of the orchestra of the Dionysiac Theater is said to be "sixty-four feet six inches (sixty Greek feet)". This statement does not square with any value of the Greek foot with which the reviewer is familiar. Professor Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and Its Drama*, 69, has a similar entry, but gives the diameter as sixty-four feet four inches. On page 179 some modification might be appropriate in connection with the phrasing of one or two matters. For example, should not the statement relative to performances at the Rural

Dionysia be restricted to the fourth century and later? Aristophanes seems to have desired particularly to win at the City festival and to have tried several times. To say that the festival "was devoted primarily to tragedy, although some comedies also were enacted" may be true, but seems subject to misinterpretation. Similarly, that "the production of tragedies <at the Lenaea> was a late addition (about 433 B. C.)" seems unnecessarily ambiguous. It was late in comparison with conditions at the City Dionysia, but not notably late compared with the introduction of comedy. The statement that "These dramas were all *new* plays during the fifth century" seems to go counter to tradition relative to the revival of Aeschylean drama after the death of the poet, a tradition that has some support in the words put into the mouth of Aeschylus by Aristophanes (*Frogs* 868).

But these are minor blemishes that for the most part spring from the desire for condensed statement and will not trouble the scholar. The author is to be congratulated upon having produced a book that is not merely attractive in appearance and highly readable, but is certainly the best treatise dealing with the field chosen and should for these reasons find its way into the hands not only of the general public but primarily of those whose interest in Greek civilization is vital.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

H. LAMAR CROSBY

CLASSICAL STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, SERIES II

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 13.183-184, Professor M. N. Wetmore gave an account of a volume entitled *Classical Studies in Honor of Charles Forster Smith*, by his Colleagues (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 3).

In 1922 the University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 15, was entitled *Classical Studies, Series No. II*, by Members of the Department of Classics.

The contents of the volume are as follows:

The Geography of Herodotus, Arthur Gordon Laird (5-19); The Guardianship of Women During the Ptolemaic and Roman Eras, Margaret Seymour Titchener (20-28); Some Modal Uses in the Papyri, Joseph Boyd Haley (29-32); Julian, Called the Apostate, Annie Maria Pitman (33-51); The Conventions of the Chorus in the Greek Drama, Walter Reid Bryan (52-80); Dionysos in the Satyr-Drama, Grace Goodrich (81-86); On Living in Harmony With Nature, Grant Showerman (87-96); The Character of Augustus, Moses Stephen Slaughter (97-110); Augustus and the Religion of Reconstruction, George Converse Fiske (111-133); Augustus, Michel Rostovtzeff (134-147); The Satirist's *Apologia*, Lucius Rogers Shero (148-167).

It is a great pleasure to call attention to a volume whose contents are so varied and rich. It is much to be regretted that lack of space forbids any consideration of the several articles in detail.

CHARLES KNAPP